IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY, MARYLAND STATE OF MARYLAND, : Criminal No. K-2008-000116 V. ASKEW W. GATEWOOD, JR., Defendant. : STATE OF MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT, : Civil No. C-2007-127156 V. ASKEW W. GATEWOOD, JR., Defendant. ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY, MARYLAND, : : Civil No. C-2007-127157 V. ASKEW W. GATEWOOD, JR., et al., : Defendants. : Annapolis, Maryland ---- June 2, 2008 TRIAL WHEREUPON, proceedings in the above-entitled matter commenced. BEFORE: THE HONORABLE EUGENE M. LERNER, Judge **APPEARANCES:** FOR THE STATE: BERNARD PENNER, ESQ. JAY E. ROBINSON, ESQ. ADAM D. SNYDER, ESQ. Office of the Attorney General Environmental Crimes Unit 1800 Washington Boulevard, Suite 6115 Baltimore, Maryland 21230 **CompuScribe**

(301)577-5882

FOR THE COUNTY:

ROBERT J. SAGER, ESQ. Office of Law 2660 Riva Road, 4th Floor Annapolis, Maryland 21401

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

JOHN F. DAUGHERTY, ESQ.
MAX HIGGINS LAUTEN, ESQ.
Kramon & Graham, P.A.
Commerce Place, Suite 2600
One South Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

HARRY L. CHASE, ESQ. 1190 West Northern Parkway, Suite 124 Baltimore, Maryland 21210

\underline{I} \underline{N} \underline{D} \underline{E} \underline{X}

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Agreement in Case No. C-2007-127156 | 6 |
| Agreement in Case No. C-2007-127156 | 7 |
| Plea Agreement in Case No. K-2008-000116 | 8 |
| Court and Defendant Re: Advice of Rights | 13 |
| Statement of Facts | 16 |
| Verdict | 22 |
| Sentence Imposed | 27 |

Keynote: "---" indicates inaudible in the transcript.

2.3

PROCEEDINGS

THE CLERK: All rise.

THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated.

(A chorus of "Good morning, Your Honor.")

MR. PENNER: As a preliminary matter, Your Honor --

THE COURT: Let me first get everybody to -- let me call the cases. We'll call the case of State of Maryland versus Askew W. Gatewood, Jr. This is Case No. 02-K-08-000116.

Yes, sir. Now I think if you would all identify yourselves for the record.

MR. PENNER: Good morning, Your Honor. For the record, my name is Bernard Penner. I'm Assistant Attorney General assigned to the Environmental Crimes Unit here representing the State in this matter.

MR. ROBINSON: I'm Jay Robinson, Assistant Attorney General, Environmental Crimes Unit, as co-counsel for the State.

MR. SAGER: I'm Robert Sager here on behalf of Anne Arundel County. There's a separate case that I believe is going to be brought up before Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, let me call that case, also. Anne Arundel County, Maryland, versus Askew W. Gatewood and others, Case No. 02-C-07-127157. And then there's the State of Maryland Department of Environment versus Askew W. Gatewood, Jr., Case No. 02-C-07-127156.

gaw

1 Yes, sir. And your name for the record? Robert 2 Sager? 3 MR. SAGER: Robert Sager, Your Honor, here on behalf 4 of Anne Arundel County. 5 THE COURT: That's S-a-q-e --MR. SAGER: S-a-g-e-r. 6 THE COURT: All right. Yes, sir. MR. SNYDER: Adam Snyder, Assistant Attorney 8 9 General, on behalf of the Maryland Department of the 10 Environment appearing in the 127156 matter. 11 THE COURT: Over here on this side? 12 MR. DOUGHERTY: Good morning, Your Honor. 13 Dougherty of Kramon and Graham on behalf of Mr. Gatewood in all 14 three matters. 15 THE COURT: All right. 16 MR. LAUTEN: Max Lauten, Your Honor, Kramon and Graham, also on behalf of Judge Gatewood. 17 18 THE COURT: Now how do you spell your last name? 19 MR. LAUTEN: L-a-u-t-e-n. 20 THE COURT: L-a-u-t-e-m. 21 MR. LAUTEN: N. 22 THE COURT: N. All right. 23 MR. CHASE: Your Honor, Harry L. Chase on behalf of Judge Gatewood in all three matters, Askew Gatewood. 24 25 THE COURT: All right. Having taken care of that,

25

MR.

regarding the consent decree, Your Honor.

I'll be glad to hear you, sir. 1 2 MR. PENNER: Your Honor, as a preliminary matter, 3 since we have three cases to be resolved this morning, we have 4 all agreed that probably the MDE case should be handled first, 5 followed by the county case, and then finally the criminal matter. 6 THE COURT: All right. MR. SNYDER: Your Honor, Adam Snyder on behalf of 8 the Department of the Environment. The Department and the 9 10 defendant, Judge Askew W. Gatewood, Jr., have reached an 11 agreed-upon resolution of the 127156 matter that we have 12 memorialized in a consent decree that we would like at this 13 time to submit to Your Honor for your review and signature, if 14 you find it acceptable, resolving that civil matter. 15 May I approach? 16 THE COURT: All right, sir. Everyone has signed it? 17 MR. SNYDER: That is correct, Your Honor. 18 : Yes, sir. MR. 19 THE COURT: Did you want to voir dire Mr. Gatewood 20 at all? 21 MR. : Regarding the consent decree, Your 22 Honor? 23 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

: No, I don't think it's necessary

1 THE COURT: All right. Today is the 2nd of June. 2 MR. : It is. 3 THE COURT: I have signed the decree. 4 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Sager? 5 MR. SAGER: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm Robert 6 7 Sager on behalf of Anne Arundel County in the matter of 07-127157. The County and Judge Gatewood have worked out a 8 9 consent judgment to be entered that disposes of all the counts 10 and the issues of fines. 11 If I may approach? 12 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 13 MR. SAGER: All the parties have signed. 14 (Pause.) 15 THE COURT: Did you wish to voir dire him? 16 MR. : I'm sorry, Your Honor. Again, on 17 this civil one, the consent judgment in 127157, it's not 18 necessary. 19 THE COURT: All right. 20 MR. Thank you, Your Honor. And we do consent to that judgment. 21 22 THE COURT: Okay. The Court has signed it. 23 MR. SAGER: Thank you, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: All right. I've signed it. Do you all 25 wish to be excused or do you want to remain? It's up to you.

1 MR. SAGER: I can wait, Your Honor, for the other 2 matter. THE COURT: Okay. 3 MR. SAGER: I don't mind staying. THE COURT: Okay. Then we're ready to proceed with 5 K-08-000116. Right? 6 7 MR. PENNER: That's correct, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 MR. PENNER: Your Honor, this matter has been the 10 subject of plea negotiations. And the State and the defendant 11 have entered into an agreement concerning the disposition of 12 these charges. That agreement has been reduced to writing. 13 And I could provide a copy with the Court with the original 14 signed plea agreement. If the Court would like, I could 15 verbally put on the record the terms of the agreement. 16 THE COURT: All right, sir. You may. MR. PENNER: This matter will proceed by way of the 17 18 defendant entering a not guilty plea to the first count of the criminal information charging filling of a state wetland 19 20 without a license. We will proceed by way of an agreed 21 statement of facts that has also been signed and will be 22 submitted for the record. 23 Following a finding of guilt, both the State and the 24 defendant agree that we will ask the Court to place the

defendant on one-year unsupervised probation with two special

conditions of probation being, first, that the defendant shall complete all work required by the site remediation plan submitted by the defendant, hereafter referred to as the site remediation, and approved by the Maryland Department of the Environment Water Management Administration and the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

This plan is specifically incorporated into this agreement by reference. The work shall be completed according to the specifications described in the approved site remediation plan. And the completion of the work shall be confirmed by both MDE and the code compliance program of the Anne Arundel County Department of Inspections and Permits.

The second special condition that we are going to ask the Court to impose on this probation is that the defendant shall pay a \$10,000 civil fine on the day of sentencing to satisfy the penalty portion of the consent decree resolved in the civil complaint captioned State versus, an historic caption, MDE versus Gatewood and others, filed in the Anne Arundel County Circuit Court, Case No. C-07-127156.

It's my -- well, in the event the defendant does not have that amount of money today, we will request a suspended -- that the amount of suspended. However, it's my understanding that the money is here. So we don't need to go into that.

Following the imposition of sentence according to the terms set forth above, the State will enter a nol pros to

the remaining counts of criminal information, K-08-116. Should the defendant file a timely motion to modify or reduce sentence pursuant to Maryland Rule 4-345, the State will remain silent on said motion provided that the defendant has successfully completed all the special conditions of his one-year probation, including the payment of the above-described civil fine.

The defendant affirms and understands that this agreement does not resolve any pending enforcement actions by the United States Army Corps of Engineers or Anne Arundel County. The Maryland Department of the Environment Water Management Administration shall monitor the defendant's compliance with the special conditions.

And that's the sum and substance of the plea agreement, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So the sentence is just -- it is the one-year unsupervised probation.

MR. PENNER: That is correct, specifically with the two special conditions articulated.

THE COURT: And if those conditions are violated, then what?

MR. PENNER: If those conditions are violated, the defendant's motion for reduction of sentence, the State will oppose the reduction of sentence.

THE COURT: Well, I guess what I'm trying to drive at, suppose that none of these -- suppose he doesn't comply at

```
all with any? You're satisfied with that.
 1
 2
               MR. PENNER: Correct. In the --
               THE COURT: Generally what I do is impose a sentence
 3
 4
    and suspend it.
 5
               MR. PENNER: That's correct. But that is not a
    portion of this agreement.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: That's not that agreement.
               MR. PENNER: That's correct. And the -- what's
 8
 9
    envisioned here, Your Honor, is that the defendant has
10
     stipulated penalties from the State consent decree. And there
11
    are also added penalties, I believe, to the County decree. And
12
     the defendant's finding of guilt will stand. And that, we feel
13
    under these circumstances, is sufficient.
14
               THE COURT: Mr. Dougherty --
15
               MR. DOUGHERTY: Mr. Lauten was going to --
               THE COURT: -- or Mr. Lauten? I'm sorry.
16
17
               MR. LAUTEN: May I have a moment, Your Honor?
18
               THE COURT:
                           Yes, sir.
19
               MR. LAUTEN: And if I may approach with the
20
     original?
21
               THE COURT: Sure.
22
               MR. LAUTEN: Your Honor, may I have a moment with
23
    counsel?
24
               THE COURT: Sure.
25
               (Pause.)
```

```
1
               MR. LAUTEN: Your Honor, if I may?
 2
               THE COURT:
                           Yes, sir.
               MR. LAUTEN: Just to clarify --
 3
               THE COURT: This is Mr. Sager.
 4
 5
               MR. LAUTEN: This is Mr. Sager in the County code
 6
     case.
 7
               THE COURT: Yes, sir.
 8
               MR. LAUTEN: It just sounded like you were concerned
 9
     about what would happen if he didn't -- this is something
10
     separate, but the County case, there would be something if he
11
     didn't meet -- there are stipulated penalties.
12
               THE COURT: No, I understand.
13
               MR. LAUTEN: --- bring the action back for
14
     contempt.
15
               (Pause.)
16
               MR. LAUTEN: Your Honor, we are ready to proceed.
17
               THE COURT: All right. It's my understanding
18
    you're agreeable to the terms that have been expressed by
19
    Mr. Penner.
20
               MR. LAUTEN: Yes, Your Honor. There is one
21
    variation in the terms that I think Mr. Penner is agreeable to,
22
    and that is the defense can request probation before judgment
23
    today. The State does not agree to remain silent as to that
24
     today. If there's a motion to modify and the work is
25
     completed, the State will remain silent at that time.
```

| 1 | THE COURT: I see. Is that all right? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. PENNER: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 3 | THE COURT: All right. Are you withdrawing all your |
| 4 | motions you previously made? |
| 5 | MR. PENNER: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 6 | THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gatewood, would you |
| 7 | stand, please, sir? |
| 8 | THE DEFENDANT: (Complies.) |
| 9 | THE COURT: Would you state your full name for the |
| 10 | record? |
| 11 | THE DEFENDANT: My name is Askew Gatewood. |
| 12 | THE COURT: Yes, sir. And how old are you? |
| 13 | THE DEFENDANT: Fifty-seven. |
| 14 | THE COURT: And how far did you complete in |
| 15 | school? |
| 16 | THE DEFENDANT: Law school. |
| 17 | THE COURT: And do you understand that you have an |
| 18 | absolute right to a jury trial? |
| 19 | THE DEFENDANT: I do. |
| 20 | THE COURT: And do you understand that a jury trial |
| 21 | will be a trial by people selected from a cross section of the |
| 22 | citizens of this county? |
| 23 | THE DEFENDANT: I do. |
| 24 | THE COURT: And do you understand that there are 12 |
| 25 | jurors and that all 12 jurors would have to agree unanimously |

before you could be found guilty of any crime, but in a court 1 2 trial, the trial judge alone can find you guilty? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 3 THE COURT: And do you understand that such trial 4 jurors, in order to find you quilty of any crime would have to 5 do so beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty, which 6 7 is the same standard required of this Court sitting without a 8 jury? 9 THE DEFENDANT: I do. 10 THE COURT: Knowing all of this, do you still wish 11 to be tried by the Court sitting without a jury? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 13 THE COURT: And have you had an opportunity to 14 discuss the election of a non-jury trial with your counsel? 15 THE DEFENDANT: I have. 16 THE COURT: And did counsel advise you as to what 17 rights you were giving up when you chose a non-jury trial over 18 a jury trial? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 20 THE COURT: Are you now under the influence of any 21 alcoholic beverage, drugs, narcotics, or medicines which 22 prevent you from understanding what you're doing now? 23 THE DEFENDANT: No. 24 THE COURT: Are you aware of any mental condition or 25 disability which prevents you from understanding what you're

1 doing now? 2 THE DEFENDANT: I am not. THE COURT: Do you have any questions about anything 3 I've said or anything about these proceedings? 4 THE DEFENDANT: I don't. 5 THE COURT: Using the reasonable doubt standard, the 6 7 Court finds that the accused has affirmatively, knowingly, and intelligently waived his right to a jury trial. 8 9 Now as I understand it, you are proceeding on a not 10 quilty statement of facts. Is that correct? 11 MR. PENNER: That's correct, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Do you have any voir dire with regard to 13 that matter? 14 : Yes, briefly, Your Honor. MR. 15 Mr. Gatewood, you understand that in addition to 16 your right to a jury trial, as the Court has explained previously, you have the right to proceed by way of trial today 17 18 and require the State to put on evidence and meet its burden of 19 proof. 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 21 MR. : And you understand that as part of 22 that, the State would be required to actually call witnesses to 23 the witness stand, and those witnesses could be cross-examined by your counsel. 24 25 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. : In addition to that, you understand that you would have the right to call witnesses on your behalf. And if they did not appear voluntarily, the Court would issue subpoenas so that you could require witnesses to appear on your behalf. THE DEFENDANT: I do. : And you understand that if you elected to do so, you could testify in your own defense in this case. And conversely, if you elected not to testify, upon request, the Court would instruct the jury not to draw any adverse inference from the fact that you elected not to testify. THE DEFENDANT: Yes. MR. And you understand that by : proceeding with a statement of facts rather than a trial, you are giving up all those rights. THE DEFENDANT: I do. THE COURT: And do you understand that in 99.999 percent of the time you are found guilty? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: All right. You may be seated, sir. THE DEFENDANT: (Complies.) THE COURT: We will receive the statement. MR. PENNER: In the matter of State versus Askew W. Gatewood, if we were to proceed to trial, the State would

2.3

present evidence to establish the following facts beyond a reasonable doubt. All these facts and events occurred in Anne Arundel County, Maryland.

Eugene Patterson will testified that he is the code compliance supervisor for the Anne Arundel County Department of Inspections and Permits. On October 13, 2006, in response to an anonymous complaint that some dump truck loads of old building material had been dumped at 8401 Bay Road, he went to that address in Pasadena, Anne Arundel County, to investigate.

He first determined that no construction or grading permits had been issued for the property. And then he went to investigate the complaint. The entrance gate was closed and locked when he arrived. He rang the gate bell, but no one answered.

From the gate, he was unable to see the shoreline of the property. And he could not observed any old building material. He returned to 8401 Bay Road and walked down a set of steps that descend the embankment onto the shoreline. He then walked along the high tide line where he could observe the old building material close up. From that location, he took photographs documenting the nature of the unauthorized material.

Patterson will further testify that he observed the material had been placed in the water along the shoreline and

up over the bank. As such, it was in the 100-foot critical area buffer. Because the material was not of the type that would be approved as proper shoreline revetment and because there was no silt fencing or other sediment controls in place at all, Patterson issued a stop work order, which he posted on the locked gate.

He then called his office to determine who owned the property and learned that the property belongs to the defendant, Askew W. Gatewood, Jr. Patterson will testify that over the next few days he continued his investigation. He notified the Maryland Department of the Environment Water Management Administration of the apparent violation, as well as the Army Corps of Engineers.

He also made several telephone calls to the telephone number listed for the defendant. The defendant gave Patterson permission to enter the property. On October 20, 2006, he returned to the property. Patterson took another set of photographs documenting his observations on that second occasion, when he had access to the top of the fill site.

Patterson will testify that following Hurricane Fran back in 1996 the shoreline along the defendant's property at 8401 Bay Road had been repaired. And that work had been authorized by the State of Maryland.

Furthermore, Anne Arundel County Inspector Vernon

Murray had inspected that work in 1997 and confirmed that the shoreline repair stayed within the scope of work approved by the state authorization. Upon completion of the work in January of 1998, the defendant and others sent Mr. Murray a letter of appreciation for assistance on the project. The 1996 authorization ended when the work was completed in 1997.

On October 24, 2006, Patterson took aerial photographs of the shoreline. He also obtained county records, aerial shoreline survey photographs, of that shoreline around 8401 Bay Road as it existed in the year 2005. Using global positioning technology, he then had a 2007 shoreline survey photograph that shows the 2006 filling activity superimposed over the 2005 photograph.

The shoreline survey photographs reveal that the 2006 filling activity extended the shoreline around 8401 Bay Road out beyond the shoreline that existed in 2005. Patterson will testify that the material placed on the shoreline of 8401 Bay Road in October 2006 filled state wetland.

Kevin Weiss will testify that he is the acting district manager for the Maryland Department of the Environment Water Management Administration's compliance program's central region. On October 16, 2006, Weiss went to 8401 Bay Road following up on information provided by an anonymous complaint and confirmed by the Anne Arundel County Department of Inspections and Permits. The property was fenced. The gate in

front of the driveway was locked.

Weiss saw the stop work order posted on the gate but could not see any construction activity. He returned to his office and was advised that the defendant had given permission to go onto his property. On October 18, 2006, together with Maryland Department of the Environment Solid Waste Program Inspector Brian Baumgartner and Compliance Section Head Brian Covlentz, Division Chief Weiss visited the site on a DNR boat, which tied up at the pier.

Weiss observed that tons of concrete and construction debris were in the fill material. The fill material rubble was spread along approximately 520 linear feet of shoreline, 50 feet of which appeared to be on a neighboring property on the Patapsco side of the point. The amount of recent fill and rubble was placed in state wetlands and ranged in widths from 16 feet out to nearly 50 feet, the 50-foot portion being near an exiting pier that ran out into Stoney Creek.

Weiss also observed that originally the shoreline had broken concrete with quarry stone-placed revetment on top of that. The recent fill material was added on top of the quarried stone running out into the channel. Weiss will testify that he checked the records of the Maryland Department of the Environment and determined that no authorization for this filling existed.

Tracy McLeif will testified that she is employed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers as a civilian office engineer. On October 16, 2006, based on information she had received from the Maryland Department of the Environment and the Anne Arundel County Department of Inspections and Permits, she checked the records of the Corps and determined that no United States Army Corps of Engineers permits had been issued for filling activity in the navigable and/or tidal waters of the United States at the confluence of Stoney Creek and the Patapsco River at the mouth of Baltimore City Harbor.

After receiving the defendant's permission to go onto the property, Ms. McLeif took photographs and measurements of the affected area and determined that in fact unpermitted filling activity had taken place.

It is further agreed between the State and the defendant that the State can produce evidence that, one, the filling activity along the shoreline of 8401 Bay Road was filling on state wetlands, as defined in Title 16 of the Environment Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland; that the defendant was required to obtain a license from the Maryland Department of the Environment prior to placing any fill material on state wetlands at 8401 Bay Road in Anne Arundel County, Maryland; and that the defendant allowed the filling of state wetlands despite the lack of a license to do so.

These are the facts upon which the State would rely

```
in this matter and to which the defendant has agreed. And I
 1
    have -- this statement of facts has also been reduced to
 2
 3
     writing, if I may approach and provide that for the Court.
 4
               THE COURT: Yes, sir.
 5
               MR. PENNER: Thank you.
               THE COURT: Is there anything you wish to say with
 6
 7
     regard to this matter?
 8
               MR.
                       : As to the statement of facts, Your
    Honor?
 9
10
               THE COURT: Yes.
11
               MR.
                           : Not at this time.
12
               THE COURT: Any motions at this time?
13
               MR.
                           : No, Your Honor.
14
               THE COURT:
                           The Court will enter a finding of guilty
15
     as to count one. Count one is filling state wetlands without a
16
    license.
                            : Your Honor, shall we proceed to
17
               MR.
18
    sentencing then?
19
               THE COURT: Yes. The question, are you going to nol
20
    pros the other counts?
21
               MR. PENNER: Your Honor, yes. However, as this
22
    particular agreement has been set up, the State is prepared to
23
    nol pros the following counts, but we are going to do that
24
    following the imposition of sentence on this one count.
25
               THE COURT: All right. I'll be glad to hear you.
```

MR. : Your Honor, first of all, I would like to tender the \$10,000 civil fine payment to the State. This is a cashier's check made payable to the Maryland Title Wetlands Compensation Fund. And it specifies a particular invoice number.

MR. : Yes, Your Honor. We would ask that the Court abide by the agreement worked out between the parties as to a period of unsupervised probation during which time Mr. Gatewood can have the property returned to its proper condition.

THE COURT: All right, sir. Anything else?

We would also like the Court to impose probation before judgment at this time. And I would suggest that for the following reasons. First of all, Your Honor, before you is a man who has been a member of the Maryland judiciary for over 20 years, who has an impeccable record, no blemishes on his record whatsoever.

And I think almost anyone who came before Your Honor under such circumstances would receive probation before judgment. In terms of hanging over his head whether or not the remediation work is going to be done, first he's got the civil case to make sure that that happens.

Secondly, let me say this, Your Honor: Mr. Gatewood acquired this property in 1990. He largely built the house with his own hands. He's put his blood, sweat and tears into

this property. He loves it dearly. He had to suffer through
Hurricane Fran and what that did to the shoreline. He got that
repaired in a way that was acceptable to the State.

Then he suffered through Hurricane Isabel. And that did further damage to the shoreline, and Hugo. And he proceeded in a way that he thought was similar to the way he had proceeded in 1996 and 1997. The vast majority of the material on that site were large chunks of concrete that he thought would be acceptable.

Towards the tail end of the project, in an unauthorized fashion, some people construction debris on the site. And that is how that came to be there. That had not been authorized by him. It certainly was not desired by him. He loves this property. He would not foul the property in any way by putting that kind of material there intentionally.

Your Honor, in light of his career, in light of what he has done today, acknowledging the State's facts, in fact acknowledging that he's paid the \$10,000 civil fine in a timely fashion, we would submit to the Court that probation before judgement today is absolutely appropriate so that we wouldn't have to come back to the court on a motion to modify.

Mr. Gatewood, you have the opportunity to say anything you would like to say to the Court, if you want to make a statement.

25

1 THE COURT: What is your comment with regard to a 2 PBJ today? MR. PENNER: Your Honor, the State is opposed to a 3 4 PBJ today. As the Court recognized earlier, unsupervised 5 probation with nothing hanging over his head is really nothing. In this case, the State has taken the somewhat unusual step in 6 7 recognizing the defendant's status of not seeking a period, some period, of incarceration, or something, not even a 8 criminal fine hanging over his head. 10 Facing a cleanup of this scope, there is a need that 11 it be executed promptly with the appropriate personnel 12 overseeing it. And the State is firmly convinced that it is 13 important that the defendant's way of establishing his ability 14 to get a PBJ is that he do this work appropriately. And until it is done, until it is done, it hasn't been done. 15 16 So the State opposes it. THE COURT: How long do you think it's going to take 17 to do this work? 18 19 MR. : Mr. Dougherty could probably speak 20 better to that, Your Honor. 21 MR. DOUGHERTY: Hurricane season permitting, this 22 summer and early fall, Your Honor, assuming the approvals 23 happen in a fairly straightforward fashion.

MR. PENNER: And Your Honor, if I may add, at the

point -- although we are requesting a one-year period, at the

point that the job is done and they want to bring their motion before the Court, the State would be prepared to come in and, you know, participate at that point. It doesn't have to take a whole year. If it's less than a year, we're happy.

MR. CHASE: Your Honor, if I might add --

THE COURT: Yes, sir, Mr. Chase.

MR. CHASE: Thank you, Your Honor. If I might add, the Court should well know that Mr. Gatewood, when requested to make repairs and do things in other instances, has always been there to do it. And I might add to what the Court said earlier, I think it is more of a --- hanging over him than if somebody came in and violated his probation, move to strike his probation before judgement, that would be more of a hammer over him than having to come back to look for the probation before judgment.

I think if the Court granted it to him today, that's holding it over his head, because he understands where the Court is coming from, that if he doesn't do what he's going to do, then it will strike the probation. And based on his judicial position, I think that would have more of an effect and more control by the Court of him knowing that the State could come in and file a motion for violation, or the Court could issue a violation to remove that probation before judgment. I think it's more than coming back to the Court.

I think I've seen, and I know the Court has seen

many times, where the Court has stricken probation before judgment because the person didn't do what they were supposed to do. And that is more of a stick than having to ask for it.

Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. : And, Your Honor, no one is more anxious that Mr. Gatewood to get this work under way. The plan that has largely been approved already was submitted by him through counsel before any of these three actions were filed. And it's simply a matter of getting the final approval. And he's raring to go on this.

I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Chase. It would be more of a hammer over his head to have the threat of the probation before judgment taken away than having him, you know, need to work for it in the first place.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything else from anybody?

(No response.)

THE COURT: The judgment and sentence of this Court is that Mr. Gatewood is placed on one-year unsupervised probation. The special conditions of the probation being that the defendant shall complete all the work required by the site remediation plan submitted by the defendant and approved by the Maryland Department of the Environment Water Management Administration and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which plan

is specifically incorporated by reference.

The work shall be completed according to the specifications described in the approved site mediation plan. And the completion of the work shall be confirmed by both the MDE and the code compliance program of Anne Arundel County Department of Inspections and Permits.

And secondly that the defendant shall pay a \$10,000 civil fine to satisfy the penalty portion of the consent decree resolving that civil complaint captioned MDE versus Gatewood, et al., filed in this court in Case No. C-07-127156.

That being the sentence in this case. And, of course, the defendant to pay whatever costs there are in this case.

With regard to the probation before judgment, I'm not going to grant that today. But I will tell you this, that as soon as the work is completed satisfactorily, I'm willing to grant that PBJ at that time.

MR. : And, Your Honor, at that time may we also request that the unsupervised probation be terminated, as well?

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MR. : Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Do you want to advise him of his rights? Oh, excuse me.

MR. PENNER: There was one procedural matter at this

| 1 | time, Your Honor. The State will nol pros the remaining counts |
|----|--|
| 2 | of that criminal information. |
| 3 | THE COURT: Do you want to advise him of his |
| 4 | rights? |
| 5 | MR. : Yes, sir. |
| 6 | You have 90 days within which to ask the Court to |
| 7 | reconsider its sentence. You have 30 days to file a notice of |
| 8 | appeal. |
| 9 | THE COURT: Any questions? |
| 10 | MR. : No, thank you. |
| 11 | THE COURT: Thank you. |
| 12 | (A chorus of "Thank you, Your Honor.") |
| 13 | (Whereupon, the hearing was concluded.) |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| ı | II |

CompuScribe hereby certifies that the attached pages represent an accurate transcript of the duplicated electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County in the matters of:

Case No. K-2008-000116

STATE OF MARYLAND

V.

ASKEW W. GATEWOOD, JR.

Case No. C-2007-127156

STATE OF MARYLAND

DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

V.

ASKEW W. GATEWOOD, JR.

Case No. C-2007-127157

ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY, MARYLAND

V.

ASKEW W. GATEWOOD, JR., et al

By: